

## REMARKS

Applicants will now address the Examiner's remaining rejection in the Office Action.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC §112

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects Claims 2-4, 7-18, 20, 25, 26, 31-62, and 65-67 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

More specifically, Applicants have the following response to each of the Examiner's objections in this rejection (for identification purposes, Applicants will refer to each of the numbered sections in the Office Action).

With regard to the section 8 and the objection to the variable "n" in Claim 2 as not being defined, Applicants are amending Claim 2 to recite "(n is a natural number)." Therefore, "n" in Claim 2 is defined, and the claim is not indefinite.

With regard to section 9 and the objection that there is an insufficient antecedent basis for "n" in Claim 2, Applicants believe that this objection is overcome by the above amendment.

With regard to section 10 and the objection that the term "image information" lacks a grammatical article, Applicants are amending Claim 2 to change "image information" to "a plurality of image information." This should overcome the Examiner's objection.

In section 11, the Examiner has a number of objections regarding Claim 2. With regard to the objection that Claim 2 is incomplete, Applicants are amending Claim 2 to

change “n bit digital video signals” in line 13 to “the n bit digital video signals.” With regard to the objection to “the period” in line 16 in Claim 2, Applicants intend that “the period” (in line 16) refers to “a period” (in line 8). It is noted that the claim recites that “the one frame period includes the period (in line 8) and a writing period.” Hence, this claim term is clear. With regard to the objection to “n first thin film transistors,” Applicants are amending Claim 2 to change “n first thin film transistors” to “the n first thin film transistors.” With regard to the objection to “n second thin film transistors,” Applicants are amending Claim 2 to change “n second thin film transistors” to “the n second thin film transistors.” These amendments should overcome the Examiner’s objections.

With regard to section 12 and the objection to the term “the period turn up successively” in Claim 2, Applicants note that “the period” references “a period in which the light emitting element emits a light” which is recited earlier in Claim 2. In addition, the claim language “the period turn up successively in one frame period” is supported at, for example, page 9, lines 5-10; and page 21, line 13 to page 28, line 25 in the specification of the present application. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the objected to term is clear.

With regard to the objection in section 13 to the term “period” in Claim 2 (line 16), this appears to be the same objection as in section 11 above. For the same reasons as discussed above, this claim term is clear.

With regard to section 14 and the objection to the term “each of gate signal lines” in Claim 2 (line 18) as having an insufficient antecedent basis, Applicants are amending Claim 2 to recite “a pixel comprising...gate signal lines” and are changing the term “each

of gate signal lines” to “each of the gate signal lines.” These amendments should overcome the Examiner’s objection.

With regard to section 15 and the objection to the term “latch signal line” in Claim 2 (line 19) as having an insufficient antecedent basis, Applicants are amending Claim 2 to recite “a latch signal line.” This should overcome the Examiner’s objection.

In section 16, the Examiner has a number of objections to Claim 3. With regard to the objection to the term “therein,” Applicants are amending Claim 3 to recite “each of the plurality of pixels comprising.” With regard to the objection to the term “n bit digital video signals,” Applicants are amending Claim 3 to recite “the n bit digital video signals.” With regard to the objection to the term “which,” this term has been deleted. With regard to the term “is stored,” Applicants mean that “each bit of the n bit digital video signals written in each of the n first memories” is stored and have amended the claim language accordingly. With regard to the term “different frequencies,” Applicants mean that n counter signals have different frequencies respectively and have amended the claim language accordingly. With regard to the term “thin film transistor,” Applicants mean a single thin film transistor and have amended the claim accordingly. These amendments should overcome the Examiner’s objections.

With regard to sections 17 and 18 and the objection to the variable “n” in Claim 3, Applicants are amending Claim 3 in a similar manner as Claim 2 as discussed above (i.e. “(n is a natural number)”). Therefore, “n” in Claim 3 is defined, and the claim is not indefinite.

With regard to section 19 and the objection to the term “the start of output of the n counter signals” in Claim 3 (line 15) as having an insufficient antecedent basis,,

Applicants are amending Claim 3 to delete “the” (first occurrence in line), i.e. “[the] start of output of the n counter signals.” This should overcome the Examiner’s objection.

With regard to section 20 and the objection to lack of grammatical article for “first information” in Claim 3, Applicants are amending Claim 3 to recite “a plurality of first information.” This should overcome the Examiner’s objection.

With regard to section 21 and the objection to the term “each bit of the n bit digital video signals inputted to the display signal generating portion” in Claim 3 (line 16) as having an insufficient antecedent basis, Applicants respectfully submit that there is an antecedent basis in lines 8 and 11. This should overcome the Examiner’s objection.

With regard to section 22 and the objection to lack of grammatical article for “second information” in Claim 3, Applicants are amending Claim 3 to recite “a plurality of second information.” This should overcome the Examiner’s objection.

With regard to the objections in sections 23-28, each of these objections to Claim 4 is similar to the objections in sections 16-18, 20-22, respectively, for Claim 3. Accordingly, Applicants are amending Claim 4 in a similar manner as Claim 3. These amendments should overcome the Examiner’s objections. In addition, with regard to “which” in line 15 of Claim 3, this refers to “a period” in the claim.

With regard to section 29-35, the objections in these sections are similar to those of Claim 3. Applicants are amending Claim 7 in a similar manner to Claim 3 in order to overcome the objections in these sections. With regard to section 35, Applicants have amended Claim 7 to recite “second information of each of the n counter signals.” These amendments should overcome the Examiner’s objections.

With regard to sections 36-43, Applicants are amending Claim 8 in a similar manner to Claim 7 in order to overcome the objections in these sections. With regard to the term “in response to”, Applicants intend that this term refers to “starting” in the claim. This amendment should overcome the Examiner’s objections.

With regard to sections 44-51, Applicants are amending Claim 9 in a similar manner to Claim 8 in order to overcome the objections in these sections. With regard to section 49, Applicants are amending “the display generation portion” to recite “the display generating portion” to correct the typographical error therein. These amendments should overcome the Examiner’s objections.

With regard to section 52, Applicants are amending Claims 10, 14-18 and 37-62 to change “A method” to “The method of driving the light emitting device.” This amendment should overcome the Examiner’s objection.

With regard to section 53, the “n” in Claims 10 and 14 differs from the “n” in independent claims. The claim term in Claims 10 and 14 is associated with “n-channel thin film transistor.” An n-channel transistor is a common term and would be well known to one having ordinary skill in the art. Therefore, this term is not objectionable.

With regard to the sections 54-59, Applicants are amending Claim 11 in a similar manner as Claim 9 in order to overcome the objections in these sections. These amendments should overcome the Examiner’s objections.

With regard to sections 60-66, Applicants are amending Claim 12 in a similar manner as Claim 11 in order to overcome the objections in these sections. These amendments should overcome the Examiner’s objections.

With regard to sections 67-73, Applicants are amending Claim 13 in a similar manner as Claim 12 in order to overcome the objection in these sections. These amendments should overcome the Examiner's objections.

With regard to section 74, the claim terms "NOR" and "OR" are well known technical terms, and terms "NOR" and "OR" are clearly supported in, for example, page 14, lines 19-24 in the specification of the present application. Therefore, these terms are common terms and would be well known to one having ordinary skill in the art. Therefore, this term is not objectionable.

With regard to section 75, the claim term "R-S flip-flop circuit" is a well known technical term, and the term is supported in, for example, page 15, line 1 in the specification of the present application. Therefore, this term is a common term and would be well known to one having ordinary skill in the art. Therefore, this term is not objectionable.

With regard to section 76, the claim term "SRAM" is a well known technical term, and the term is supported in, for example, page 37, lines 2-7 in the specification of the present application. Therefore, this term is a common term and well known to one having ordinary skill in the art. Therefore, this term is not objectionable.

With regard to section 77, Applicants are amending Claims 18, 41, 46, 51, 56 and 61 to change "the frequencies" to "frequencies." This amendment should overcome the Examiner's objection.

With regard to sections 78-84, Applicants are amending Claim 20 in order to overcome each of the objections in these sections. These amendments should overcome the Examiner's objections.

With regard to the objection in section 80 to the term “in which” in Claims 20, Applicants intend the term to refer to “a period” in the claim. With regard to the term “the period turn up successively,” this term is not objectionable for similar reasons as discussed above for the term in the objection in section 12. Therefore, this term is not objectionable.

With regard to the objection in section 83 to the term “the period” in Claim 20, this term is not objectionable for similar reasons as discussed above for section 11. Therefore, this term is not objectionable.

With regard to the objection in section 84, Applicants are amending Claim 20 in a similar manner as Claim 2 as discussed above for section 14. These amendments should overcome the Examiner’s objections.

With regard to section 85, Applicants are amending Claims 26, 32, 34 and 36 to change “A device” to “The electronic apparatus.” This amendment should overcome the Examiner’s objection.

With regard to sections 86 and 87, Applicants are amending claim 65 to change “A method” to “The method of driving the light emitting device.” This amendment should overcome the Examiner’s objection.

With regard to sections 88 and 89, Applicants are amending claims 66 and 67 to change “A light emitting device” to “The light emitting device.” This amendment should overcome the Examiner’s objection.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that each of the §112 objections have been overcome, and it is requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any fee should be due for this amendment, please charge our Deposit Account No. 50-1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 29, 2008

/Mark J. Murphy/  
Mark J. Murphy  
Registration No. 34,225

COOK ALEX LTD.  
200 West Adams Street  
Suite 2850  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
(312) 236-8500

Customer No. 26568